

~~SECRET~~

21 July 1950

Addition to reply to Webb Letter

Paragraph 2 of the Staff Study, entitled "Facts Bearing on the Problem" is put forth as the basis for demanding that the DCI use departmental agencies and facilities in the production of National Intelligence. We believe that the Act does not support this conclusion. Section 102(d)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 enumerates two separate functions of CIA. First, to "correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security," and second, to "provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government . . ." The Act further specifies, however, that such dissemination is to be conducted in a manner which will utilize "where appropriate existing agencies and facilities."

When producing National Intelligence, the Director of Central Intelligence has always desired to use the capacities of the departmental agencies. However, it should be understood that this policy has never been undertaken because of mandatory provisions in the National Security Act.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

2

Additions to Reply to Webb

With regard to paragraph 5 of the Facts Bearing on the Problem, operating procedures were established by 1948 DCI directives 3/1 and 3/2 to which the Intelligence Chiefs agreed at that time.

With regard to paragraph 6 "Discussion," I should be glad to know what the Departmental agencies mean by "national intelligence" since they agreed in 1948 to NSCID 3. My ideas on an improvement of this definition are shown in the enclosure herewith. I should also like to know what are the "inadequacies of existing mechanisms and procedures." I do not think that "integration" of departmental products is always necessary by the cooperative process to produce intelligence relating to the National Security.

SECRET

SECRET

3

Add at beginning to paragraph 6 in Reply to Webb:

I note that your Staff Study in paragraph 9 says that confusion in CIA can only be cured by an organizational separation of staffs preparing National Intelligence Estimates and doing research. I still feel that there must be a close tie-in (not separation) of Researchers and Estimators.

SECRET

SECRET

Addition to Paragraph 2 of 18 July Draft Letter to Mr. Webb

I note in the Staff Study about the "Composition" of the new "Intelligence Advisory Committee" (page 2 of your proposed National Security Council Directive) that it is not stated whether the new Committee is composed of the Intelligence Chiefs themselves of the existing intelligence agencies (the same as the present Intelligence Advisory Committee) or of their "full-time representatives" "at I.A.C. Headquarters." Nothing is said about this new Committee being under the Chairmanship of the Director of Central Intelligence or his representative, and no other name is given to the full-time representatives at "I.A.C. Headquarters."

Elsewhere there are indications that the D.C.I. is expected to be a type of Production Manager for the new Committee and that he, as well as the other members of the new Committee, may dissent from an Estimate prepared by the new Committee's National Estimates Staff.

SECRET